



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,494	10/01/2003	Hiroyoshi Takamiya	03500.017689	4236
5514	7590	07/14/2005	EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK, NY 10112			FIDLER, SHELBY LEE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2861	

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/674,494

Applicant(s)

TAKAMIYA, HIROYOSHI

Examiner

Shelby Fidler

Art Unit

2861

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10/1/2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The specification and claims are replete with grammatical errors and non-idiomatic English.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishikawa et. al. (6580521) in view of Adams et. al. (6834929).

With regards to claim 1, Nishikawa teaches a print control apparatus (col. 1, line 9) with selecting means for selecting print modes (col. 24, lines 23-24) and processing means for processing in the selected print mode (col. 24, line 65 – col. 25, line 3). Nishikawa does not teach print modes that concern the origin of drawing. Adams discloses a printing method for selecting between print modes (col. 6, lines 53 and 59) in which the first mode sets the drawing origin away from a sheet edge by a specified offset (normal printing mode, col. 6, line 53), and the second mode sets the sheet edge to the origin (borderless print mode, col. 6, line 59). At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Nishikawa's print control apparatus with Adam's print modes. The motivation for doing so, as taught by Adams, is to allow borderless printing leaves no unprintable margins (col. 1, line 37).

Art Unit: 2861

With regards to claim 2, Nishikawa teaches a mode using conventional PDL (col. 23, lines 38-41).

With regards to claim 3, Nishikawa does not teach a mode using the new PDL. Adams discloses a print mode using the new PDL (borderless printing, col. 3, line 10-15).

With regards to claim 4, Nishikawa teaches matching a drawing image with a center of an output sheet (col. 4, lines 8-13).

With regards to claim 5, Nishikawa teaches processing means that forms information indicative of the print mode and drawing position (col. 24 line 67 – col. 25, line 3) and transmits the information to a printer (col. 25, lines 3-4).

With regards to claims 11 and 12, Nishikawa teaches a print system (col. 13, line 28) comprising an instructing means (printer driver, col. 5, line 55), selecting means (printer controller, col. 6, line 3), and printing means (print engine 17, col. 6, line 8). Nishikawa does not teach print modes that concern the origin of drawing. Adams discloses a printing method for selecting between print modes (col. 6, lines 53 and 59) in which the first mode sets the drawing origin away from a sheet edge by a specified offset (normal printing mode, col. 6, line 53), and the second mode sets the sheet edge to the origin (borderless print mode, col. 6, line 59). At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Nishikawa's print system with Adams' print modes. The motivation for doing so, as taught by Adams, is to allow for borderless printing, which leaves no unprintable margins (col. 1, line 37).

Claims 6-8, 13-15, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroi et. al. (6734986) in view of Adams.

With regards to claim 6, Kuroi teaches of a print control method comprising of a selection step for selecting print mode (col. 3, lines 57-58), and a processing step for processing information indicative of the selected print mode (col. 3, lines 58-59). Kuroi does not teach of print modes that concern the origin of drawing. Adams discloses a printing method for selecting between print modes (col. 6, lines 53 and 59) in which the first mode sets the drawing origin away from a sheet edge by a specified offset (normal printing mode, col. 6, line 53), and the second mode sets the sheet edge to the origin (borderless print mode, col. 6, line 59). At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kuroi's program with Adams' print modes. The motivation for doing, as taught by Adams, is to allow for borderless printing, which leaves no unprintable margins (col. 1, line 37).

With regards to claim 7, Kuroi does not teach a print mode for coping with conventional PDL. Adams teaches of a print mode for coping with conventional PDL (normal printing mode, col. 3, line 3).

With regards to claim 8, Kuroi does not teach a print mode for coping with new PDL. Adams teaches of a print mode for coping with new PDL (borderless printing mode, col. 3, lines 9-10).

With regards to claim 13, Kuroi teaches a program (col. 4, lines 18-19), comprising a selecting step for selecting between print modes (col. 4, lines 20-21), and processing step for processing in the selected print mode (col. 4, line 19). Kuroi does not teach of print modes that concern the origin of drawing. Adams discloses a printing method for selecting between print modes (col. 6, lines 53 and 59) in which the first mode sets the drawing origin away from a sheet edge by a specified offset (normal printing mode, col. 6, line 53), and the second mode sets the

Art Unit: 2861

sheet edge to the origin (borderless print mode, col. 6, line 59). At the time of invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kuroi's program with Adams' print modes. The motivation for doing, as taught by Adams, is to allow for borderless printing, which leaves no unprintable margins (col. 1, line 37).

With regards to claim 14, Kuroi does not teach a print mode for coping with conventional PDL. Adams teaches of a print mode for coping with conventional PDL (normal printing mode, col. 3, line 3).

With regards to claim 15, Kuroi does not teach a print mode for coping with new PDL. Adams teaches of a print mode for coping with new PDL (borderless printing mode, col. 3, lines 9-10).

With regards to claim 18, Kuroi teaches a program that includes a printer driver program (col. 4, line 22).

Claims 9-10 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroi in view of Adams as applied to claims 6 and 13 above, and further in view of Nishikawa.

With regards to claims 9 and 16, Kuroi does not teach print modes for centering images on the output sheet. Nishikawa teaches matching a drawing image with a center of an output sheet (col. 4, lines 8-13).

With regards to claims 10 and 17, Kuroi does not teach a processing means that forms information indicative of the print mode and drawing position and sends it to a printer. Nishikawa teaches processing means that forms information indicative of the print mode and

Art Unit: 2861

drawing position (col. 24 line 67 – col. 25, line 3) and transmits the information to a printer (col. 25, lines 3-4).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SLF



Michael Tokar
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800